In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

THIRD SERIES · VOLUME 10 · PART 2
JULY 2000

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
FOR THE ROYAL ASIATIC SOCIETY

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland

60 Queen's Gardens, London W2 3AF

EDITOR

Dr Sarah Ansari

Royal Holloway University of London

ASSISTANT EDITOR

Mrs Charlotte de Blois

PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Professor F. C. R. Robinson (Chairman)
Dr Sarah Ansari (Editor)
Ms Andrea P. A. Belloli (in attendance)
Mr F. C. de Blois (in attendance)
Mr J. Price (in attendance)
Mr P. H. Collin
Miss Helen Cordell
Dr J. Kolbas
Dr E. U. Kratz
Dr V. Martin
Mr C. C. F. Naylor
Dr R. Söhnen-Thieme
Dr G. H. R. Tillotson
Mrs P. M. Vaughan

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society (ISSN 1356-1863) is published for the Royal Asiatic Society in April, July and November by Cambridge University Press.

The Editor of the *Journal* invites the submission of original scholarly articles on the anthropology, archaeology, architecture, art, history, languages, literatures, philosophies and religions of all parts of Asia, together with north Africa and Ethiopia. Books sent for review in the *Journal* will be reviewed or listed there; those not reviewed cannot be returned.

© The Royal Asiatic Society 2000

Subscriptions: *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* (ISSN 1356-1863) volume 10, series 3 subscription prices (excluding VAT), valid until 31 December 2000, are per volume, £64 UK and elsewhere (US $104) for institutions, £40 (US $63) for individuals ordering direct from the publisher and certifying that the journal is for their personal use. Single issues cost £23 (US $37). US dollar prices apply to USA, Canada and Mexico. Prices include delivery by air where appropriate. EU subscribers (outside the UK) who are not registered for VAT should add VAT at their country's rate. VAT registered subscribers should provide their VAT registration number. Orders, which must be accompanied by payment, may be sent to a bookseller, subscription agent or to the publishers: Cambridge University Press, The Edinburgh Building, Shaftesbury Road, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK or Cambridge University Press, Journals Fulfillment Department, 110 Midland Avenue, Port Chester, New York, NY 10573–4930, USA. Japanese prices for institutions are available from Kinokuniya Company Ltd, P.O. Box 55, Chitose, Tokyo 156, Japan.

Fellows of the The Royal Asiatic Society automatically receive the journal. Information about the Society may be found at the end of the journal.

Back Issues: Back volumes up to and including 1983 are available from Schmidt Periodicals GmbH, Dettendorf, D-8201 Bad Feilnbach 2, Germany. Subsequent volumes prior to the present series are available from The Royal Asiatic Society. Back volumes in the present series are available from Cambridge University Press.

Advertising: Apply to Cambridge University Press, UK or North American Branch.

Copying: This journal is registered with the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, USA. Organisations in the USA who are also registered with the CCC may therefore copy material (beyond the limits permitted by sections 107 and 108 of US copyright law) subject to payment to CCC of the per-copy fee of $9.50. This consent does not extend to multiple copying for promotional or commercial purposes. Code 1356-1863/2000/$9.50.

Organisations authorised by the Copyright Licensing Agency may also copy material subject to the usual conditions. *ISI Tear Sheet Service*, 3501 Market Street, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104, USA, is authorised to supply single copies of separate articles for private use only. For all other use permission must be sought from Cambridge or the North American Branch of Cambridge University Press.

Internet Access: This journal will be included in the Cambridge Journals Online service which can be found at http://www.journals.cup.org. For further information on other Press titles access http://www.cup.cam.ac.uk or http://www.cup.org.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Problems of Name and lineage: relationships between South Indian authors of the Śaiva Siddhānta

DOMINIC GOODALL

A review article of Somaśambhupaddhati. Rituels dans la tradition sivaïte selon Somaśambhu. Quatrième partie: rituels optionnels: pratiṣṭhā. texte, traduction et notes. Hélène Brunner-Lachaux. 1998.

Publications du département d'indologie 25.4. Institut français de Pondichéry/École française d'Extrême-Orient, Pondicherry. pp. lxviii, 514.

With this fourth volume Mme. Brunner-Lachaux completes her richly annotated translation of the influential eleventh-century book of rituals of the old pan-Indian Śaiva Siddhānta by Somaśambhu. The first of these volumes appeared in 1963, among the first fruits of the study of the Sanskrit texts of the Śaiva Siddhānta pursued by the French Institute of Pondicherry (hereafter IFP). Since then much has been discovered about the history of the development of the Śaiva Siddhānta (a great deal through the efforts of Brunner-Lachaux herself) and a number of its texts have seen publication,[1] so that it is only

[1] The ground-breaking first editions published by the IFP of some scriptures of the school – three of which are accompanied by the exceptionally rich commentaries of the tenth-century Kashmirian exegete Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha, whose works had a formative influence on Saiddhāntika theology – are well-known. Research, inaugurated by the IFP with the publication in 1961 of the first volume of an edition of the *Rauravāgama* (ed. N. R. Bhatt, Publications de l'Institut français d'indologie No. 18, Pondicherry) into the scriptural and commentarial literature of the theological school of the Śaiva Siddhānta has made large strides in thirty years. That institute's initial objective was to collect and edit as much as possible of all Saiddhāntika literature, of which it now houses the world's greatest manuscript collection. Over the years a differentiated picture has emerged of the historical development of the school, of its spread over the Indian sub-continent and beyond (to Cambodia) before it came (mistakenly) to be thought of as no more than a regional development of the Tamil-speaking South, and of its influence on thinkers of other persuasions, notably in Kashmir in the ninth to thirteenth centuries. It has become clear that many of the Saiddhāntika scriptures are comparatively late South Indian compositions which were never adduced as authorities by (and therefore almost certainly not known to) the masters of the school in the period in which its presence was pan-Indian. (Many discoveries in the field are those of Alexis Sanderson, for, even though none of his articles are ostensibly devoted to the Śaiva Siddhānta, many bear on it, in particular his "Doctrine of the Mālinīvijayottaratantra", pp. 281–312 in Teun Goudriaan (ed.) *Ritual and Speculation in Early Tantrism: Studies in Honor of André Padoux* (State University of New York Press, 1992); his "Meaning in Tantric Ritual", pp. 15–95 in *Essais sur le rituel III. Colloque du centenaire de la section des sciences religieuses de l'Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes sous la direction de Anne-Marie Blondeau et Kristofer Schipper* (Louvain, Paris: Peeters, 1995) and his forthcoming "History through Textual Criticism in the Study of Śaivism, the Pāñcarātra and the Buddhist Yoginītantras" a paper delivered at the international colloquium "Sources and Time" held in Pondicherry in 1997, organised by the École française d'Extrême-Orient and the French Insitute of Pondicherry.) The IFP has directed attention both towards the demonstrably early scriptures and their commentaries (e.g., as alluded to above, *Mataṅgapārameśvarāgama* (*Vidyāpāda*) *avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha*, ed. N. R. Bhatt (Publications de l'Institut français d'indologie No. 56, Pondicherry, 1977), *Sārdhatriśatikālottarāgama avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha*, ed. N. R. Bhatt, Publications de l'Institut français d'indologie No. 61 (Pondicherry, 1979), *Mataṅgapārameśvarāgama (Kriyāpāda, Yogapāda et Caryāpāda) avec le commentaire de Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha*, ed. N. R. Bhatt, Publications de l'Institut français d'indologie No. 65 (Pondicherry, 1982)) as well as to works more recently acknowledged as scriptures (e.g. the body of text that now passes under the name *Ajitāgama*, edited in 3 volumes

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

to be expected that there should be a gulf between the first and fourth volumes (hereafter SP1, SP4, etc.). It is therefore excellent news that Brunner-Lachaux intends to produce an entirely revised SP1 (announced on p. lxv).

The present volume contains a full introduction (pp. i–lxv), followed, in a format that will be familiar to those who know the other volumes, by the Sanskrit text of the last part of the *Somasambhupaddhati* (= SP) with, on facing pages, densely annotated translation (pp. 1–419), then five appendices (pp. 421–52),[2] bibliography and tables (pp. 453–63), and an admirably detailed index (pp. 465–503). The contents of the Sanskrit text, as analysed on pp. vii–viii, are as follows: *śilānyāsa/padādhvara*, I; *liṅgapratiṣṭhā*, II and III; *gaurīpratiṣṭhā*, IV; *ādityapratiṣṭhā*, V; *viṣṇupratiṣṭhā*, VI; *dvārāśritapratiṣṭhā*, VII; *hṛtkumbhapratiṣṭhā*, VIII; *cūlaka-dhvajadaṇḍa-dhvaja-devakulapratiṣṭhā*, IX; *jīrṇoddhāravidhi*, X; *maṭhapratiṣṭhā*, XI; *puṣkariṇīpratiṣṭhā*, XII; *kūpapratiṣṭhā*; XIII; *vṛkṣapratiṣṭhā*, XIV.

As Brunner-Lachaux states at the outset (p. i), there is essentially only one topic treated in the fourteen chapters of this last volume: *pratiṣṭhā*; "et bien que ce terme . . . ne signifie pas exactement la même chose dans tous les cas, il implique toujours l'Installation de Puissances divines dans des supports concrets". The most important of these *pratiṣṭhā* rites, since it serves as a model for the others, is the *liṅgapratiṣṭhā*. The volume's sub-title indicates that Brunner-Lachaux has classed these rites as *kāmya* ("rites optionnels"), and this she defends against the position she ascribes (p. ii) to the commentator on the SP that they are *naimittika*. Attached to this discussion are Brunner-Lachaux's most recent thoughts on whether Somaśambhu intended to speak also of public ("*parārthapūjā*") and not just of private worship ("*ātmārthapūjā*"), categories which she observes are themselves not used by Somaśambhu and appear only in relatively late tantras (pp. iv–v). She concludes, "Notre réponse est maintenant ferme: il s'agit de rituel privé seulement."

After a brief discussion of the various agents involved in the rites (pp. ix–xi), the introduction proceeds with an analysis of the contents of each chapter of the Sanskrit text (pp. xi–xxxi), and a discussion of problems and oddities in Somaśambhu's treatment of the topic (pp. xxxi–xliii).

In a departure from the previous volumes, Brunner-Lachaux has devoted space (pp. xliii–lii) to a welcome examination of what is known about Somaśambhu and his commentator Trilocana (to whom she also devotes appendices I and II). It is a mark of her scholarship that she takes the trouble repeatedly to rethink her ideas in the light of newly

by N. R. Bhatt, Publications de l'Institut français d'indologie No. 24 (Pondicherry, 1964, 1967, and 1991)). But a reader will search in vain in the introductions to these editions for discussion of the relative dating of the scriptures of the Śaiva Siddhānta. Some notes towards such a relative chronology are to be found on pp. xxxvi–lxxiv of my own work: *Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭha's Commentary on the Kiraṇatantra. Volume I: chapters 1–6. Critical edition and annotated translation*, ed. and trans. Dominic Goodall. Publications du département d'indologie 86.1 (Pondicherry: 1998).

Of the recent editions of Saiddhāntika works that have not appeared in the series of the IFP, the most important is that of the only prose work of the earliest Saiddhāntika theologian by whom works survive: *Le Tantra de Svayaṃbhū, vidyāpāda, avec le commentaire de Sadyojyoti*, ed. and trans. Pierre-Sylvain Filliozat, École Pratique des Hautes Études-IV[e] Section, Sciences historiques et philologies II, Hautes Études Orientales 27 (Geneva: 1991). This has been reissued with an English translation under the title *The Tantra of Svayaṃbhū vidyāpāda With the commentary of Sadyojyoti*, Kalāmūlaśāstra Series 13 (Delhi: 1994).

[2] These give (1) an edition and translation of the conclusion of the commentary of Trilocana; (2) a list of authors and works cited by name in the commentary; (3) the *astramantras* used for *diśāhoma*; (4) the text and translation of the *praveśabali* drawn from Īśānaśivācārya's unpublished **Pratiṣṭhākriyādīpikā* (and other sources); and (5) a list of Sanskrit botanica with their corresponding Latin names.

* is used to mark unpublished texts throughout this review article.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

discovered evidence, and in this interesting section she overturns the view (expressed in SP1, p. xli) that Somaśambhu was a South Indian, and presents the case for his having been a Kashmirian who became the head of a Golakīmaṭha situated in the Dahalamaṇḍala somewhere between the Ganges and the Narmadā (pp. xliii–xlv). It is plain in her discussion of lineages that the evidence is complicated (not to say riddling) because of the dual problem that so often besets those who try to unravel accounts of Indian genealogies (or, for that matter, literary references): the problem of very narrow and at the same time very broad onomasty, by which I mean that some names are borne by a large number of different persons (or books), and some individuals are known by a variety of names: worldly names, initiatory names and names in which the elements are varied with what are intended to be synonyms.

We need to be especially cautious about identifications when reconstructing the lineages of Saiddhāntika authors. Consider the 108 figures in the Airāvateśvara temple in Darasuram that are carved "on the wall of the northern verandah to the west of the *maṇḍapa* in the north-east corner of the *prākāra*".[3] Below each of these has been engraved a label, probably of the same period as the sculptures (i.e. twelfth-century). The majority of the figures were Saiddhāntika initiates, probably ācāryas, since for almost all of them their names', provenance (the place names seem all to be those of the Tamil-speaking South) and initiatory names were all recorded. Whether or not these are figures of one line of *maṭhādhipa*s or, as P. R. Srinivasan suggests,[4] personages who officiated in an important function, such as the consecration of the temple (in which case their presence suggests an instance of the kind of intimate connection between the Siddhānta and temple worship that late Siddhāntatantras, such as the *Kāmika*, speak of), their labels provide evidence of the range of Saiddhāntika initiatory names that were popular in that area. For eighty-eight the initiatory names are still legible, and among these eighty-eight there were 24 Īśānaśivas; 19 Aghoraśivas; 9 Tatpuruṣaśivas; 7 Dharmaśivas; 6 Hṛdayaśivas; 4 Sadāśivas; 3 Sadya[ḥ]śivas and Sūkṣmaśivas; 2 Jñānaśivas, Anantaśivas, Astraśivas and Vairāgyaśivas; and one each of the following: Netraśiva, Rudraśiva, Mūrtiśiva, Śrīkaṇṭhaśiva, Śikhāśiva. Now perhaps not one of these was an author (eight appear to have been village headmen (?) [*kiḻavar*]), but the list bears witness that Īśāniśiva, Aghoraśiva, and Hṛdayaśiva/Sarvātmaśambhu, for instance, are likely to crop up in many unrelated writers' lineages. It is evident that the commonest type of Saiddhāntika initiatory name has as its first member a name of one of the principal mantras (i.e. one of the *brahma-* or *aṅga-mantras* or one of the mantras of the throne) and as its second -śiva/-śambhu.[5]

Brunner-Lachaux is sensitive to the problem, but it is to be expected that at some steps in her argumentation others might judge differently. In fn. 53 on p. xlvii, for example, it is alleged that the Sarvātmaśambhu who authored the *Siddhāntadīpikā* was also the guru of

[3] P. R. Srinivasan, in *Darasuram: epigraphical study, étude architecturale, étude iconographique. Tome 1 — texte.* Françoise L'Hernault, with the collaboration of P. R. Srinivasan and Jacques Dumarçay. Publications de l'École française d'Extrême-Orient, Mémoires archéologiques XVI (Paris, 1987) p. 31.

[4] *ibid.* p. 21.

[5] R. Nagaswamy, *Śiva Bhakti* (New Delhi, 1989) pp. 220–1, mentions that there is an inscription in the Bṛhadīśvara temple in Tanjore recording the names of forty-eight singers and two instrumentalists, who were employed to recite the *Tēvāram* in the temple by Rājarāja Coḻan. The reciters are called Bhaṭārar there and, as in Darasuram, both ordinary and initiatory names are given. The initiatory names that Nagaswamy lists all follow the same pattern, with the exception of Vyomaśiva, Yogaśiva, Satyaśiva, Pūrvaśiva, and Oṃkāraśiva.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Aghoraśiva. Certainly one of Aghoraśiva's gurus was a Hṛdayaśiva,[6] which, as Brunner-Lachaux argues (p. xlvi, fn. 51), can be a synonym of Sarvātmaśambhu, but a comparison of the *Siddhāntadīpikā*[7] with Aghoraśiva's doctrinal works makes this identification seem, to me, unlikely; furthermore there is some evidence that this Sarvātmaśambhu was himself the disciple of (an) Aghoraśiva.[8] Brunner-Lachaux suggests as a possibility (p. 1, fn. 63) a further identification of this Hṛdayaśiva with the Hṛdayaśiva who compiled the old **Prāyaścittasamuccaya* transmitted in Nepal that I have drawn attention to; but it is unlikely that this Hṛdayaśiva was Aghoraśiva's preceptor because of the discrepancies in what we know about their lineages (see Goodall, *op. cit.*, pp. xii–xvii, fn. 24 and xliii–xliv, fn. 98). In the same footnote she suggests that it may have been Hṛdayaśiva's **Prāyaścittasamuccaya* that the commentator on the SP refers to, and this is definitely not possible.[9] Brunner-Lachaux has not happened to spot that in fact one of the two quotations which Trilocana gives in his commentary on the *Somaśambhupaddhati* (that quoted on p. 317 of SP2) is to be found in the **Prāyaścittasamuccaya* attributed to a Triloçana which is transmitted in South Indian MSS (IFP MS T. 1060, p. 45, lines 4–5).[10]

This brings me to the identity and œuvre of Trilocana, the commentator on the SP, about which I have come across more evidence than Brunner-Lachaux was aware of, and since this evidence supplies one important fact about Trilocana's intellectual background – important in that it links him to the most celebrated Saiddhāntika of South India and dates him – I present it below.

The commentary on the SP contains two quotations attributed to a **Prāyaścittasamuccaya*, one of which, as I have just mentioned, is to be found in the **Prāyaścittasamuccaya* transmitted in South Indian MSS. The commentary also contains two references to (but not quotations from) a **Prāyaścittasaṅgraha*, which is explicitly said to be by the author of the commentary. Now Brunner-Lachaux argues that if the quotations (and not just the references) had been from a work by the commentator, then he would have made this explicit, and that the names **Prāyaścittasamuccaya* and **Prāyaścittasaṅgraha* do not refer to the same work. I am not convinced that either of these propositions must be true. It seems to me after all possible that the commentator might have been the author also of the **Prāyaścittasamuccaya* that survives in South India. (This was what Brunner-Lachaux first

[6] See Goodall, *op cit.*, pp. xxii–xvii, fn. 24.

[7] Published under the title *Siddhāntaprakāśikā*, ed. T. R. Damodaran in Vol. XXXIII (1984) of *The Journal of the Tanjore Maharaja Serfoji's Sarasvati Mahal Library* and, more recently, under the title *Siddhāntaprakāśikā of Sarvātmaśambhu. Translation with Notes*, ed. Vrajavallabha Dwivedi. Research Publication Series No. 9 (Varanasi, 1996).

[8] When the same *Siddhāntadīpikā* appears in IFP MS T. 284, it follows a work called the **Sarvamatopanyāsa*, a doxographical work in ślokas (pp. 1–23) that covers a handful of rival doctrines, concluding with the *śaivamata*. There is an elaborate concluding verse on p. 23 and the colophon: *iti sarvamatopanyāsaḥ sampūrṇaḥ*. There follows an appendix of scriptural quotations, and then, on p. 30, the following couplet: *iti sarvamatasthānām uktvā siddhāntam āditaḥ/ paścād aghoraśiṣyeṇa sarvātmaśambhunā mayā/ śaivānaṃ samayasthānāṃ śaivasiddhāntadīpikā/ sadāśivapadasthena cittena samudīritā/ / iti śam.* There then follows the familiar (because it has been published) *Siddhāntadīpikā* of Sarvātmaśambhu, which is probably the text referred to in the verse just quoted (though it is conceivable that it is a quite different work that merely happens to follow).

[9] The original part of that work consists of an introduction of forty-five verses and a few concluding verses (which may not be by the hand of the compiler) that give some details of the compiler's lineage. The bulk of the work is a concatenation of chapters relating to *prāyaścitta* (from various tantras) quoted in their entirety (including colophons) and without any remarks connecting them or commenting on them by the compiler.

[10] The other quotation I have not been able to locate, but I have hitherto searched through only one manuscript.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

supposed (SP2: xx), but now denies (SP4: l–li).) But, as Brunner-Lachaux points out, if we assume this to be the case, we run up against the problem that the remarks made at the beginning of this **Prāyaścittasamuccaya* that may be supposed to be about its author's lineage cannot obviously be reconciled with what the author of the commentary on the SP says about his lineage in his concluding verses (SP4, Appendix I). Most problematic is that the list at the beginning of the former (SP4: 1, fn. 60) concludes with an Aghoraśiva, while the lineage of the latter concludes with a Jñānaśiva, whom Brunner-Lachaux identifies (SP4: 423, fn. 14) with the author of a *paddhati* called the **Jñānaratnāvalī*[11] The concluding verses of this **Jñānaratnāvalī* (IFP MS T. 231, pp. 642–3) state that Jñānaśiva lived in Vārāṇasī and give what can be interpreted as the same lineage as that of the commentary on the SP.[12]

But before we react by rejecting the possibility that the two works could be by the same Trilocana, we should reflect on the evidence of references within the commentary that suggest its author actually was a disciple of Aghoraśiva: IFP MS T. 170, p. 114; *catussaman tāni catvāri candanādidravyāṇy uktam atra* (conj.; *asya* MS) *asmadgurubhiḥ mṛgendrapaddhatau*[13] *"candanāgarukarpūrakuṅkumāni ca māruta" iti*, and, on p. 27: *uktaṃ pañcāvaraṇastave ['s]madgurubhiḥ*.

The first quotation (from the commentary on SP2, 1:56b) is indeed to be found in a **Mṛgendrapaddhati*, a work of Aghoraśiva that is fragmentarily transmitted in IFP MS T. 1021 (pp. 1–64), followed by a commentary by the author's pupil, Naṭeśaguru (pp. 65–253).[14] The quoted line appears in IFP MS T. 1021 on p. 42, line 9.[15] The second reference, to his

[11] Brunner-Lachaux urges (p. lvi) that this work should be edited if manuscripts of it could be found other than the one corrupt and lacunose source known to her, IFP MS T. 231. (An edition from just this manuscript would certainly be difficult.) As she rightly points out (p. lvi, fn. 73), IFP MS T. 107 bears the title *Jñānaratnāvalī*, but wrongly (she mentions no reason why she knows the title to be wrong, so it is perhaps worth pointing out one indication: IFP MS T. 107 twice [pp. 6 and 17] gives labelled quotations from the **Jñānaratnāvalī*). Brunner-Lachaux does not mention IFP MS T. 106 (which may be a transcript of part of the same codex as IFP MS T. 107; both are said to have been copied from a manuscript "belonging to C. Swāmināṭha Śivāchārya, Secretary, South Indian Archaka Association, Madrass"), part of which (pp. 13–60) also bears the title *Jñānaratnāvalī*. The text it gives begins with a *maṅgala* verse (lost in IFP MS T. 231) and shares a few large quotations with IFP MS T. 231, but the connecting prose, which includes the texts of mantras, is quite different. It seems to me probable that it is a manual based on the **Jñānaratnāvalī*.

[12] The lineages are the same from Dharmaśambhu, Jñānaśiva's guru's guru's guru, whom both accounts refer to as having mastered a lakh of verses: Trilocana's account (SP4: 423) uses the expression *śivamatāgamalakṣavettā* and the **Jñānaratnāvalī* (IFP MS T. 231, p. 642) mentions him thus: *śrīdharmaśambhur ity eṣa lakṣādhyāyīti śrutaḥ*. Knowing a lakh of verses appears as an optional qualification for an *ācārya*, e.g. in Rāmanātha's **Siddhāntadīpikā* [verse 133ab: *lakṣādhyāyī bhavet saptasaṃhitādhyayano 'thavā* IFP MS T. 914, p. 8].

[13] Brunner-Lachaux's Appendix II, which lists citations of other works in Trilocana's commentary on the SP, mentions two quotations of the **Mṛgendrapaddhati* (I have noticed three: on pp. 113, 114, 174), but she does not record that one of them is additionally labelled *asmadgurubhiḥ* (perhaps because this was the quotation she missed, or perhaps because IFP MS T. 170 misleadingly punctuates after *asmadgurubhiḥ*).

This useful appendix could have been made yet more useful if references to the pages of the MS had been consistently been given. Not that the page references that do appear do not use the pagination of IFP MS T. 170 but the pagination (noted in the margins) of its exemplar.

[14] The existence of this manuscript and the state of its text are mentioned by Brunner-Lachaux in footnote 61 on p. xxiv of her *Mṛgendrāgama. Section des rites et section du comportement avec la vṛtti de Bhaṭṭanārāyaṇakaṇṭa. Traduction, Introduction et Notes*, Publications de l'Institut français d'Indologie No. 69 (Pondicherry, 1985). As Brunner-Lachaux there points out, the final colophon (IFP. MS T. 1021, p. 253) gives Naṭeśaguru's initiatory name as Vaktraśambhu, a "synonym" of Tatpuruṣaśiva.

[15] Suspicion as to whether the author is really the famous Aghoraśiva is justified, since its final colophon is missing, the commentator Naṭeśaguru does not mention its author's name, and I have noticed no cross-references in it to others of his works (or to it in his other works); but one of the internal prose colophons (IFP MS T. 1021, p. 12) uses the biruda "*lakṣadvayādhyāpaka*", which we know from colophons in, for example, Aghoraśiva's **Sarvajñānottaravṛtti* (IFP MS RE 47818) and **Dviśatikālottaravṛtti* (IFP MS T. 176), and the internal colophon

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

guru's apparently lost **Pañcāvaraṇastava*,[16] is of significance because this is quoted elsewhere as a work of Aghoraśiva,[17] and because Naṭeśaguru also mentions it as the work of his guru, thus corroborating that Naṭeśaguru and the commentator on the SP shared the same teacher.[18] One other reference, to the commentator's guru's **Mohaśūrottaravṛtti* (following Brunner-Lachaux's plausible suggestion towards an emendation in fn. 19 on p. 429), is probably also to a work of Aghoraśiva, since Aghoraśiva himself mentions having composed a commentary on the **Mohaśūrottara* in a concluding verse in his **Dviśatikālottaravṛtti* (quoted by Goodall, *op cit.*, p. xv). (The **Mohaśūrottara* itself Brunner-Lachaux supposes to

verses are in a plausible style. Compare, for instance, that of the conclusion of the **Sarvajñānottaravṛtti* (quoted Goodall, *op cit.*, p. xvi) with the following: *ity agnikāryabalibhojanabhaikṣamudrāḥ proktā hitāya kṛpayā bhuvi dīkṣitānām/śrī . . . śśatasaṇkhyapadyair leśād aghoraśivadeśikakuñjareṇa/* (IFP MS T. 1021, p. 24). Furthermore we would not expect many references to other works in it because it is entirely in verse and because it is expressly intended to follow the teachings of a single scripture.

As an aside, I feel impelled to comment on the epithet of Aghoraśiva just mentioned, *lakṣadvayādhyāpaka*, because others have speculated rather wildly on what it means. The article on Aghoraśiva in the *New Catalogus Catalogorum* (an article now in need of thorough revision) improbably suggests that *lakṣadvaya* is an expression that refers to the Mīmāṃsā. This is based on a misinterpretation of a verse that forms part of an anecdote about Śālikanāthamiśra, the Raja of Cochin and the Zamorin of Calicut narrated by C. Kunhan Raja on p. 7 of his introduction to *Bṛhatī of Prabhākara Miśra [on the Mīmāṃsāsūtrabhāṣya of Śabarasvāmin] with the Bhāṣyapariśiṣṭa of Śālikanātha [Tarkapāda]*, ed. S. K. Ramanatha Sastri, Madras University Sanskrit Series, No. 3, Part II (Madras, 1937). The verse in question is:

> *dvaite lakṣadvayādhīti cādvaite lakṣapāraṇaḥ*
> *adyāpi vidyālābhāya jāgarmy eva jarann api.*

C. Kunhan Raja's translation wrongly implies (by clumsy use of definite articles) that the Mīmāṃsā is spoken of as consisting of two lakhs of verse-length units: "Having studied the two lakhs of Granthas in Dvaita (Mīmāṃsā) and having reached the further shore of the lakh of Granthas in Advaita, even now I keep awake to earn knowledge though I am aged." Clearly the speaker rather intends to say that he has studied two lakhs of verse-length units of text relating to the Mīmāṃsā and half of that amount relating to Vedāntic Advaita. The no less improbable interpretation that Aghoraśiva claimed to have taught two hundred thousand pupils has been put forward more recently by Rohan A. Dunuwila (p. 69 of his fundamentally unreliable *Śaiva Siddhānta Theology: a context for Hindu-Christian Dialogue*, [Delhi: 1985]) and, apparently independently, by Richard H. Davis (p. 368 of his "Aghoraśiva's Background", *The Journal of Oriental Research, Madras* Vols. LVI–LXII (1986–92), 1992, pp. 367–78) and, with some hesitation, by Jörg Gengnagel (p. 14 of his *Māyā, Puruṣa und Śiva: Die dualistische Tradition des Śivaismus nach Aghoraśivācāryas Tattvaprakāśavṛtti*, Beiträge zur Kenntnis südasiatischer Sprachen und Literaturen 3, [Wiesbaden, 1996]). I propose that the expression means "teacher of two hundred thousand verses", in support of which I adduce the above-mentioned verse cited by C. Kunhan Raja and the prescription of Rāmanātha's **Siddhāntadīpikā* cited in fn. 12 on p. 209 above.

[16] The *New Catalogus Catalogorum* (s.v. *Pañcāvaraṇastuti*) records that a manuscript of a *Pañcāvaraṇastuti* (for which it mentions no author, but which might be the work of the famous Aghoraśiva) is described in a supplementary twentieth volume of the descriptive catalogue of the Sanskrit manuscripts preserved in the Saraswati Mahal Library, Tanjore: "TD 22062–4 XX Sup. No. 872 (p.)". (This twentieth volume is not at the moment available to me.)

[17] Anantaśambhu twice quotes from it attributing it to Aghoraśiva in his commentary on the *Siddhāntaśārāvalī* ad verses 20 and 78 (ed. K. R. Parthasarathi, T. H. Viswanathan, *Bulletin of the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras* Vol. XVII.2, p. 25 and Vol. XVIII.2, p. 27.)

[18] Naṭeśaguru's opening verses are these (IFP MS T. 1021, p. 65): *śivaṃ śivatvasamprāptikāraṇaṃ karuṇānidhim/ praṇamāmi gaṇeśaṃ ca gurusaṇjñaṃ śivaṃ tataḥ/ śrīkālottarabhedeṣu catuśśatikasaṇjñitam/ †sampradāyena garbheṇa† vivṛtaṃ gurubhiḥ purā/ sarvajñānottarādīni śāstrāṇi vyākṛtāni ca/ śrīmanmṛgendrasaṇjñasya* (conj.; °*saṇjñaca* MS) *paddhatiś ca kriyākrame/ racitā*(em.; *racitaṃ* MS) *gurubhiḥ pūrvaṃ pañcāvaraṇasaṇjñitam/ stotraṃ ca tena racitaṃ dhyānaśāstrānusārataḥ/ śrīmanmṛgendrapaddhatyāḥ praṇetāraṃ gurūttamam/ praṇipatya vidhāsyāmi ṭīkām asyās †tv apekṣite†/ asyāṃ tu yāny anuktāni sūryārcādīni santatau/ kriyamāṇāni cātraiva karmāṇy api vadāmy aham.* Note that it is not made explicit that Naṭeśa is the direct disciple of Aghoraśiva (and he was not his son, since the final colophon mentions that Naṭeśaguru's father was called Śaṅkara), but these verses do serve to identify the author of the *paddhati* with the author of a *Pañcāvaraṇastotra*. Naṭeśa's interesting work quotes widely from a similar range of early sources to that drawn on by the commentator on the SP, and it is not implausible that they should both have been co-pupils of a single guru. In one place (p. 165) he refers to a **Siddhāntasamuccaya*, but I have not been able to identify a passage to which he might be alluding to the **Siddhāntasamuccaya* attributed to a Trilocanaśiva (for which see below).

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

have been lost [p. 459 and elswhere], but two manuscripts survive in Nepal of a **Mohacūḍottara*, and these, as I have shown, [Goodall, *op cit.*, p. xlvii, fn. 107], transmit the text known in South India as the **Mohaśūrottara*.)

From the evidence presented immediately above, it seems that the commentator on the SP was a disciple of Aghoraśiva as well as of Jñānaśiva,[19] and this enables us with some confidence to date the commentator on the SP to the second half of the twelfth century, for Aghoraśiva dates the composition of his *Kriyākramadyotikā* to 1157 AD.[20] Many a writer must have had many gurus, particularly in the Śaiva Siddhānta, where the label might refer to the man who performed his initiation, as well as to his natural father or to any one of a number of teachers. Trilocana actually also gives information (unmentioned by Brunner-Lachaux) about his genealogical (as opposed to spiritual) lineage at the beginning of his commentary, and this seems not to include either Aghoraśiva, or Jñānaśiva.[21]

Until now I have been cautiously referring to "the commentator on the SP" and not

[19] That Jñānaśiva might just be another name of Aghoraśiva has been suggested in the *New Catalogus Catalogorum* (s.v. Aghoraśiva); but even if Jñānaśiva were another of Aghoraśiva's names, he could not, because of what we know about his lineage, be the Jñānaśiva who authored the **Jñānaratnāvalī* and who appears to be the Jñānaśiva to whom the commentator on the SP refers. Furthermore the evidence for assigning the name Jñānaśiva to the famous Aghoraśiva is slim: a (prose) colophon of a manuscript of a part of a *Kriyākramadyotikā* (Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras MS No. 5436) recorded on p. 4233 of *A Descriptive Catalogue of the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras, Vol. XI* by M. Rangacarya (Madras, 1911).

[20] For confirmation of Aghoraśiva's date, see Goodall, *op. cit.*, p. xiii–xvii, fn. 24. Brunner-Lachaux had reached the conclusion that the *Siddhāntasārāvalī* must have been written before the early 14th century (p. xlix, fn. 57), but only on the questionable evidence that that work is quoted in the *Śataratnasaṅgraha*, a work now traditionally attributed to the same Umāpati who was the great-grand-disciple of Meykaṇṭar (according to verse 5 of the *pāyiram* of his *Civappirakāśam*) and who wrote a number of Saiddhāntika treatises in Tamil, including the *Caṅkarpanirākaraṇam*, the introduction to which recounts that it was based on a discussion held in Chidambaram in 1313 AD (both the *Civappirakāśam* and the *Caṅkarpanirākaraṇam* appear in the 1988 University of Madras edition of the *Meykaṇṭacāttiraṅkaḷ*). It is, I think, problematic to assume that the various Saiddhāntika works in Sanskrit and Tamil attributed to authors called Umāpati are all by the same man (see Goodall, *op. cit.*, p. xliv, fn. 99 and N. R. Bhatt's "Paśu and Pāśa in Śataratna-saṅgraha" pp. 70–82 in *Śrī Umāpati Śivācārya: His Life, Works and Contribution to Śaivism*, ed. S. S. Janaki. Madras: Kuppuswami Sastri Research Institute, 1996, p. 71).

[21] The opening is defective, hence the uncertainty: . . . *prathitaś coḷamaṇḍale/ lebhe sekottarāṃ dīkṣām asmād asmatpitāmahaḥ/ nāmnāsadāśivo loke sabhāpatir iti śrutaḥ/ sa mahābhāgyayogena mahādevam ajījanat/ so 'pi labdhādhikāro 'smād abhūt siddhāntapāragaḥ/ īśānaśiva ity anyad dīkṣāyām apy abhakta yaḥ/* (conj.; *dīkṣāyām api bhakti yaḥ* MS) *vidvatsandehanāśāya nirvicāraḥ pravartate.* (IFP MS T. 170, p. 1). IFP MS RE 25188 does not have these *ślokas* but joins IFP MS T. 170 at this point for the following verse in *śārdūlavikrīḍita* (IFP MS RE 25188, f. 142^{r}, lines 1–2):

> *sarvādhvordhvapade sthitaṃ paraśivaṃ śaktiṃ gaṇeśaṃ gurūn*
> *natvā somaśivoktapaddhativare durbodhako yo 'ṃśakaḥ*
> *tat sarvaṃ gurutaś ca śāstrasamayāt jñātaṃ pravakṣye kramād*
> *āmardāśramadeśikānvayabhavaḥ śrīnetraśambhu[ḥ] sphuṭam*

• *paraśivaṃ śaktiṃ gaṇeśaṃ gurūn*] em.; *paramaśivaṃ śaktiṃ gaṇeśeṃ gurūn* 25188; *paraśivabhaktiṃ gateśaṃ gurun* T. 170 • °*vare durbodhako yo 'ṃśakaḥ*] 25188; °*paraṃ durbodhako 'dhośayaḥ* T. 170 • *tat sarvaṃ*] 25188; *jñātvā sad* T. 170 • *jñātaṃ pravakṣye*] 25188; *jñātaprasaṅga*° T. 170 • °*kānvayabhavaḥ*] conj.; °*kāhvayabhava*° 25188; °*kānvayabhava*° T. 170 (Brunner-Lachaux quotes this last line on p. xlix, fn. 58, replacing the "*śrī*" by "*[tri]*", but that would be unmetrical.)

I interpret this opening as follows: ". . . who was famous [under the name . . .] in the Cōḷa region. From him my grandfather, by [initiatory] name Sadāśiva [and] known in the world as Sabhāpati, received initiation, followed by consecration [as an *ācārya*]. He [viz. Sabhāpati] by good fortune begot [my father] Mahādeva, and that [Mahādeva] too, who received in initiation another [name], that of Īśānaśiva, received responsibility [as an *ācārya*] from him [viz. from the same man as my grandfather received it from] and became one who reached the further shore of [knowledge of] the [Śaiva] Siddhānta. Without [the need to pause for] reflection he is active in destroying the doubts of the wise. After bowing to the supreme Śiva, who stands at the place above the entire universe, to his Śakti, to Gaṇeśa and to [all] gurus, I shall [now] teach clearly [and] in [due] order all those portions that are difficult to understand in the excellent *paddhati* of Somaśambhu [and] which I, Netraśambhu, born of the lineage of teachers of the *āśrama* of Āmarda[ka], have learnt also from [my] gurus in accordance with the rules of scripture."

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

considering which other works attributed to authors called by the name Trilocana (or variants thereof) he might have composed (other than the **Prāyaścittasamuccaya*, for which the evidence is, I think, inconclusive). With appropriate caution Brunner-Lachaux suggests (SP4: 1) that the *Siddhāntasārāvalī* and the commentary on the SP may have been by the same Trilocana. The *Siddhāntasārāvalī* does not give information about the author's immediate gurus, but there is evidence, of which Brunner-Lachaux was not aware, to be found in a work by the author's great-great-grandson, the anonymous commentator on the *Śivapūjāstava* of Jñānaśiva.[22] This commentator gives a long quotation of forty and a half verses prefaced by (p. 22) *evam evāsmatpitāmahapitāmahena siddhāntasārāvalīkṛtā trilocanaśivena dviśatīmantroddhāreṇa so 'rtho nirūpitaḥ/ tadyathā . . .*, and the quotation ends thus (p. 26): *iti dviśatisūtroktamantroddhāro vivecitaḥ/ śrīmadāmardakasthānaguruvaṃśaprarohiṇā/ guruṇā dṛkcchivākhyena kārtikeyaprasādataḥ/*[23] *iti tasmād dviśatyāṃ sa brahmāṅgo mūlamantrataḥ*. This Trilocana, who may with some confidence be accepted to have been also the author of the *Siddhāntasārāvalī*, here gives as his guru a certain Dṛkchiva, which I propose is intended as a synonym of Jñānaśiva, the name of the guru of the commentator on the SP, since *dṛk* (or *dṛkchakti*) not infrequently appears as a synonym for *jñānaśakti* in Saiddhāntika works.

As an aside, it is worth recording that if the commentator on the *Śivapūjāstava* is really the great-great-grandson of the commentator on the SP and if the two therefore lived within two centuries of each other, then this anonymous author gives us a rough *terminus ante quem* of c. 1350 AD for the composition of some "late" South Indian tantras, for, unlike his great-great-grandfather, he quotes from the *Kāraṇa*, *Acintya*, *Suprabheda*, South Indian *Pauṣkara*,[24] *Śuddhākhya*, and quite frequently and at length from the *Kāmika*.[25] I mention this because Brunner-Lachaux could be understood to be implying the *Kāraṇa* and *Kāmika* to be yet later when she includes them (p. lii, fn. 68) in a list of tantras which in the South came to be considered to be the most important "à partir du XVIème s. environ".[26] It

[22] Identified as the author also of a **Jñānaratnāvalī* of seven thousand *granthas* in the commentator's introduction to the first verse. This identification may be questioned on the grounds that that the Jñānaśiva who wrote the surviving **Jñānaratnāvalī* claimed to live in Vārāṇasī, whereas the *Śivapūjāstava* concludes with: *viprottuṅgaś coḷadeśī ca sūriḥ śambhoḥ pūjāstotraṃ etat pavitraṃ/ siddhāntajño jñānaśambhuḥ śivoktyā cakre bhaktyā bhuktaye muktaye ca.* (*Śivapūjāstavaḥ Savyākhyaḥ Jñānaśambhuśivācāryaviracitaḥ*, ed. K. M. Subrahmaṇyaśāstrin. Śivāgamasaṃghaprakāśitagranthasaṃkhyā 19. Devakoṭṭai, 1935, pp. 109–10.) But a verse at the conclusion of the *pavitrakavidhi* of the **Jñānaratnāvalī* (IFP MS T. 231, p. 222) reveals that its author was a brahmin from the Coḷa country (*śrīcoḷadeśasambhūta-*(conj.; *-sambhūtā* MS) *-bhūsureṇa tapodhinā / śrīmajjñānaśivenāyaṃ pavitrakavidhiḥ kṛtaḥ*), and verses elsewhere (IFP MS T. 231, pp. 272 and 420) express his devotion for Dabhrasabheśvara of Chidambaram (perhaps his home town) and for Viśveśvara of Benares. (I am indebted to Professor Sanderson of All Souls College, Oxford, for pointing out to me these allusions to the South in the **Jñānaratnāvalī*.)

[23] The "grace of Kārtikeya" is appropriate because the **Dviśatikālottara* was taught by Śiva to Skanda.

[24] For the lateness of this particular work, see Goodall, *op. cit.*, pp. xliii–xlv.

[25] e.g. *Uttarakāmika, ācāryābhiṣekapaṭala* 84–85b, 87c–91b and *Pūrvakāmika* 1:18c–19, 21 on p. 53, and *Uttarakāmika* 1:83–9 on pp. 81–2 – the verse numeration is that of the reprints of the South Indian Archaka Association, Madras 1975 and 1988.

[26] Richard Davis, on the other hand, places the *Kāmika* implausibly early: "I would propose, as a tentative approximation, that the most significant recasting of the *Kāmikāgama* took place in Tamilnad during the eleventh century, in light of Cola-period temple culture [*sic*] and under the strong influence of the Śaiva Siddhānta school. Some of its contents are no doubt older than this, and some have been added since, but the weight of the text is grounded, it seems to me, in that period" (p. 13 of Richard Davis' *Ritual in an Oscillating Universe: Worshiping Śiva in Medieval South India* (Princeton, 1991)). This dating seems to me difficult to defend, because neither the works of Aghoraśiva, whom we know to have flourished in Chidambaram in the middle of the twelfth century, nor those of his immediate disciples quote from or refer to this published *Kāmika*. Furthermore the notion that the printed text is a "recasting" of an earlier *Kāmika* seems to me questionable, since there is no evidence to support it other than the fact that the name *Kāmika* is an old name for a Siddhāntatantra. Early quotations attributed to the

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

should be clear from this how useful it can be to uncover the relationships between Saiddhāntika authors. To this end the task of compiling a comprehensive prosopography, however, daunting, must be addressed, for by dating more authors relative to one another we would be in a position to provide relative dates also for more authorless texts, and thereby we would be closer to an understanding of the development of the school. The radical transformation of the Śaiva Siddhānta in the Tamil-speaking South, in particular, is an extraordinary and, I think, largely misunderstood phenomenon, the study of which cannot be addressed without a plausible relative chronology of its texts. Scholars have for too long relied either on Sanskrit or on Tamil sources, but never on both, and so have not been in a position to challenge some, I believe, patently impossible datings, particularly of certain Tamil authors.[27] This does not just mean a skewed picture of the development of the Siddhānta in almost all secondary literature; it can distort the chronology of related schools too.[28]

Aside from the *Siddhāntasārāvalī*, and overlooked by Brunner-Lachaux, there is another extant work which may have been the work of the same Trilocana, and that is the **Siddhāntasamuccaya*.[29] The grounds here for ascription are, however, much less secure; the **Siddhāntasamuccaya* quotes from the same range of sources as the commentary on the SP (these are helpfully listed in Brunner-Lachaux's Appendix II, pp. 428–9), shares a similarly "classical" theology, and in some places echoes Aghoraśiva.[30] The **Siddhāntasamuccaya* yields no information about the author's genealogy or teachers, but states in its conclusion that its author was the head of a Maṭha in Tiruveṇkāṭu (Śvetāraṇya).[31] Whether or not the

Kāmika by Abhinavagupta (see Goodall, *op. cit.*, p. xliv, fn. 103) might equally be from an ancient lost *Kāmika* for which the surviving printed *Kāmika* was intended as a replacement. Davis' book is of course not primarily concerned with the historical development of the Śaiva Siddhānta, since it is intended as a synchronic account of Saiddhāntika ritual 'at the high point of Śaiva ritualism" (Davis, *op cit.*, p. 19).

[27] The placing of Tirumūlar's *Tirumantiram* between the fifth and the seventh century, for example, is widely accepted on the basis of scant evidence. As I have attempted to demonstrate (Goodall, *op. cit.*, pp. xxxvii–xxxix, fn. 85), if the *Tirumantiram* were really written in the sixth century, then we would have to accept that we find in a Tamil work the first attestation of a nexus of ideas – with Sanskrit labels – that did not make its appearance in any other related Saiddhāntika literature until at least six centuries later and at the end of a development that we seem to be able to trace through Sanskrit sources that are later than the sixth century.

[28] Thus we find Douglas Renfrew Brooks (on p. 47 of his *The Secret of the Three Cities: An Introduction to Hindu Śākta Tantrism* (Chicago, 1990)) asserting that "[b]y the sixth century, elements of Śrīvidyā in written form are present in the work of Tirumūlar" (see preceding footnote). Brooks apparently manages to believe this because he persuades himself that "Śrīvidyā, like most Sanskrit-based forms of Hindu Tantrism, certainly predates its first systematic literary presentations in the eleventh and twelfth centuries" (*ibid.*).

[29] The name is *Siddhāntārthasamuccaya* in the opening verses but *Siddhāntasamuccaya* in the concluding ones. The work is transmitted in IFP MS T. 284 (pp. 127–74) and IFP MS T. 801 (pp. 97–103) [both transcripts of Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras MS R. 6635], in IFP MS T. 206 (pp. 56–111) and in Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras MS R. 14393 (pp. 1–52).

[30] Particularly striking is a passage (IFP MS T. 284, pp. 141ff) echoing Aghoraśiva's commentary on *Tattvasaṅgraha* 56c–57b, which in turn has been largely lifted from Rāmakaṇṭha's commentary on *Mokṣakārikā* 146–7. I deduce that Trilocana follows Aghoraśiva here because, though both Trilocana's and Aghoraśiva's remarks and quotations derive ultimately from Rāmakaṇṭha's commentary, there is a much closer relationship in phrasing between the passages by the two of them than there is between Rāmakaṇṭha's commentary and either one of the two.

[31] IFP MS T. 284, p. 174: *śrīlocanaśivācāryaiḥ sitāraṇyamaṭhādhipaiḥ/ sarvāgamāt samuddhṛtya siddhāntasya samuccayam/ sarveṣāṃ śaivamukhyanāṃ asmābhiḥ samyag īritam/ iti siddhāntasamuccayam/ trilocanaśivācāryacaraṇebhyo namaḥ*. Note that the name given in the verse is Śrīlocana. When the verse is quoted in A. A. Ramanathan and T. H. Viswanathan's introduction to the *Siddhāntasārāvalī* (*Bulletin of the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras* XVII.1, p. 31), this is "corrected" to Trilocana, but this emendation is unnecessary, for cf. the last opening verse of the commentary on the SP quoted in fn. 21 on p. 211 above. The same editors here point out that Anantaśambhu, the commentator on the *Siddhāntasārāvalī*, refers to its author as *āmardakāśramanivāsī*; but I am

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

commentator on the SP was the same as this Maṭhādhipa in Śvetāraṇya, it is worth noting that it is extremely unlikely that he is to be identified with another Trilocana who was a Maṭhādhipa in Śvetāraṇya, namely the author of the **Siddhāntarahasyarāra* (IFP MS T. 284, pp. 175–88),[32] since the latter's pedestrian style and Vedānticizing doctrine are incompatible with all the works attributed to Trilocana discussed above.[33]

I shall permit myself one more remark about Trilocana's commentary on the SP. Should anyone wish to attempt the rewarding task of editing it, they will wish to know of three other uncatalogued manuscripts that transmit it: one is in the Government Oriental Manuscripts Library, Madras: MS R 14735 (paper, Devanāgarī, pp. 1–165); a second is in the French Institute of Pondicherry: MS RE 47635 (palm-leaf, Grantha script, ff. 62^{r}–127^{r}); and the third is in the *maṭha* at Tiruvāvaṭuturai (described, under the siglum A_2, in Goodall, *op. cit.*, p. xcviii).

We come now to the most important feature that sets SP4 apart from the previous volumes. Brunner-Lachaux has consulted a much wider ranger of sources for the text of the *paddhati* itself than hitherto, most importantly a number of Nepalese manuscripts of the text (presented on pp. lii–liv[34]), one of which is dated to 1151 AD, less than sixty years after the composition of the text in 1095/6,[35] and an edition of the *Agnipurāṇa*, in which a version of the text of all but five chapters of SP4 has been incorporated. This is indeed a most welcome improvement, for there is scarcely a page of text where the testimony of these additional sources has not offered improvements to the text of the Devakoṭṭai edition,[36] and there is a smaller – but still very large – number of instances where they improve on both the Devakoṭṭai and the Kashmirian editions (hereafter D and K respectively),[37] which have in previous volumes served as Brunner-Lachaux's base text. Brunner-Lachaux therefore rightly accords primary importance to the testimony of the Nepalese manuscripts (p. liv): "comme les mss N sont dans l'ensemble bien meilleurs que les autres et plus anciens, nous avons adopté leurs leçons même lorsque ce choix ne s'imposait pas, celles des mss du Sud étant également acceptables".

But Brunner-Lachaux still does not offer a critical edition (as she admits on p. lxi):[38] not

inclined to disregard this as Anantaśambhu failing to distinguish between belonging to the (legendary) *vaṃśa* of Āmardaka and living in a place called by that name.

[32] The corrupt concluding verse runs (IFP MS T. 284, p. 188): *trilocaneśena sītāṭavīśvara-*(conj.; *sītāṭavīśa-* MS [unmetrical]) ⏑ – *stikādvaitamaṭhādhipena/ viśuddhaśaivāgamacakravartināpy akāri siddhāntarahasyasārāḷ*/ I assume that the name Sitāṭavi (a conjecture, but necessary because the metre requires that the first syllable of the name be short) is, like the names Śvetāraṇya and Sitāraṇya, intended as a translation of the Tamil name Tiruveṇkāṭu.

[33] I mention this because Vrajavallabha Dwivedi, echoing the *New Catalogus Catalogorum*, encourages this erroneous identification in his introduction to his new edition of the *Siddhāntasārāvalī*, where he refers to the text as the *Sarvamatasiddhāntarahasyasāra* and identifies it with the **Siddhāntasamuccaya* (*Siddhāntasārāvali of Trilocanaśivācārya. Short Commentary by Saddharma Ujjayini Pīṭhādhīśvar Shri 1008 Jagadguru Marulasiddha Śivācārya Mahāswāmiji. Full Commentary and Edited by Pt. Vrajavallabha Dwivedi*, Research Publication Series 16 (Varanasi, 1998) p. 6.

[34] Note that the manuscript numbers given are said (p. liii) to be those given in the Nepal-German Manuscript Preservation Project, but they are not the microfilm reel numbers of that project; they appear rather to be the numbers of the National Archives, Kathmandu.

[35] Thus colophon verse 4 on p. 418.

[36] See, e.g., 1:15a (p. 14, fn. 44), 1:19b (p. 18, fn. 55), 1:36b (p. 31, fns. 95 and 96), 1:37b (p. 32, fn. 99), 1:40a (p. 32, fn. 105), 1:47b (p. 40, fn. 123), 1:50b (pp. 42–3, fn. 132), etc., etc.

[37] e.g. 1:19d (p. 18, fn. 56), 1:21a (p. 19, fn. 60), 1:22a (p. 20, fn. 62 – but here Brunner-Lachaux does not tell us what the readings of the editions are), 1:31a (p. 28, fn. 84), 1:33b (p. 28, fn. 88bis), 1:53d (pp. 44–5, fn. 148), 1:60b (p. 47, fn. 162), etc.

[38] Since this expression is today so variously understood among indologists, I must state what I understand by it. A critical edition is an editor's reconstruction of a text as he supposes it to have been at a particular time

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

all the available evidence has been used, for there are manuscripts that have not been collated (p. liii), and, more importantly, the readings of the collated sources are not all reported. The only source that Brunner-Lachaux has decided to report consistently is D (p. lxi).[39] The reason, she explains (p. lxi), for doing so in just this one case is to demonstrate that D is not as trustworthy as has commonly been supposed, and this is indeed demonstrated. In some instances, however, it would really be useful to know what all the manuscripts read: e.g., 1:22d, which is unmetrical as constituted by Brunner-Lachaux, for it ends with *śalyam ākhyanti* (fn. 65 on p. 22 implies that she intended to accept *ākhyānti*, also unmetrical). Of all the reported readings only that of D is metrical (*ākhyati*); "les manuscrits du Sud ont des leçons erronées". The same goes for 1:61, the translation of which begins (p. 48), "On se représentera le Vāstu comme un Asura aux cheveux ramassés [en chignon] . . ."; at this point Brunner-Lachaux comments (fn. 163): ". . . Ceci si l'on accepte la leçon *ākuñcitakacam* de la plupart de nos sources [*sic*]. Mais on attendrait plutôt une expression signifiant 'au corps contracté.' " But since *ākuñcitakacam* is the only reading Brunner-Lachaux gives, and since she does not make explicit which sources have it, her readers do not have the evidence to judge her decision or to attempt to improve on the text she has suggested to be suspect.

In one other respect the edition might have been improved: the variant readings that Brunner-Lachaux reports are not conveniently gathered together in an apparatus but are mixed up amongst the annotation to the translation. This means that to find whether variants are reported for a given verse the reader must consult the French translation, ascertain which footnote numbers are attached to the translation of that particular verse, and then scan those footnotes (sometimes lengthy and not on the same page).

There are commendably few misprints in the Sanskrit text, and such slips as there are tend to be easy to spot and correct.[40] Brunner-Lachaux's translation and plentiful annotation, which quotes from a wide variety of both published and unpublished sources that are not all easy of access, make the subject approachable for all – most readers would be often lost without her valiant efforts at elucidating such technical obscurities as the twelve types of *marman* of the *vāstupuruṣa* in 1:65–6 and the removal of *śalya*s from the site in 1:21–2. These sources drawn on for parallels are almost all later than Somaśambhu's manual, not contemporaneous with or earlier than it; but this imbalance could in the future be corrected, for we can now distinguish, in large measure because of Brunner-Lachaux's studies, between the texts that were and that were not Somaśambhu's sources, and, in large measure because of the labours of the French Institute of Pondicherry and of the Nepal

in its transmission (in this case the time of its composition). Although it is a hypothesis, it is made on the basis of all evidence for the wording of the text that the editor can consult (ideally all surviving evidence) and by an editor who has striven to understand as far as possible the ideas of the author(s) as well as the relationships between the sources that make up that evidence, and it is equipped with an apparatus that reports all of that evidence that is relevant to the constitution of the text (in some cases this means all the evidence). Such editions, as yet all too rare, are invaluable tools for all who are interested – from any perspective – in texts and their transmissions.

[39] Actually there are instances where she does not report even D's readings, e.g. 1:22a (p. 20, fn. 62).

[40] e.g. *śataṃ tu* in 1:52a should be corrected (as is implied by the translation and by fn. 139 on p. 42) to *śatādi; prajapeñca* in 1:52c (p. 45), should read *prajapec ca; athaliṅgapratiṣṭhāyāṃ* in 2:1 (p. 69) should read *atha liṅgapratiṣṭhāyāṃ*.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

German Manuscript Preservation Project, we can also identify manuscripts of more of the texts that were his sources.[41]

Quibbles aside, SP4 is thus a good and useful book on *pratiṣṭhā* rites. In fact it represents indological study of the kind more should be striving towards: it is erudite, careful, not problem-shirking, well-indexed, and always close to primary sources.

[41] Prominent among the unpublished though surviving texts that Somaśambhu used for this part of the text are the **Piṅgalāmata*, the **Mohaśūrottara*, and the **Mayasaṅgraha* (on which a commentary by Bhaṭṭa Rāmakaṇṭa II's disciple, Bhaṭṭa Vidyākaṇṭha II, also survives, described by Goodall, *op. cit.*, pp. x–xi), all of which deserve editions.

Aside from these *pratiṣṭhātantras*, I propose that the **Parākhyatantra* (part of the relevant portion of which is quoted by Goodall, *op. cit.*, pp. liv–lv, fn. 121) served as the source of the list of *tattveśvaras* tabulated in Pl. 1, p. 467.

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

NOTICE TO CONTRIBUTORS

All editorial communications should be addressed to The Editor, Royal Asiatic Society, 60 Queen's Gardens, London W2 3AF, UK.

Contributions submitted for publication in the *Journal* should be typed in double spacing throughout on one side of A4 or equivalent paper, leaving a margin of at least 1½ inches at the left-hand side. Sheets should be numbered consecutively. Notes, numbered consecutively through the article, should be typed in double spacing on separate sheets at the end.

References and notes should be typed in the form of the following examples:

1. G. H. Luce, *Phases of pre-Pagán Burma: Languages and History* (Oxford, 1985), i, pp. 171–8.
2. *Ibid.*, p. 30.
3. C. E. Bosworth, "Ghaznevid military organisation", *Der Islam*, XXXVI (1960), pp. 40–50.
4. M. Sharon, "The Ayyubid walls of Jerusalem", in *Studies in Memory of Gaston Wiet*, ed. M. Rosen-Ayalon (Jerusalem, 1977), pp. 179–95.
5. B. Z. Kedar (ed.), *Jerusalem in the Middle Ages* (Jerusalem, 1979), p. 122.

When an article has been accepted for publication, the author is strongly encouraged to send a copy of the final version on computer disk (Apple Macintosh or IBM compatible PC) together with the hard copy typescript, giving details of the wordprocessing software used (Microsoft Word, Word or WordPerfect). However, the publisher reserves the right to typeset material by conventional means if an author's disk proves unsatisfactory.

Chinese and other non-Roman scripts must be supplied in the form of camera-ready copy. In case of difficulty, the Editor should be consulted.

Contributions should be submitted in a form ready for the printer: later corrections can be accepted only at the Editor's discretion and may incur a charge to the author. Authors will receive page proofs.

Authors of articles will be supplied with 25 free copies of offprints. Additional copies may be bought if ordered at proof stage on the offprint order form sent out with the proofs.

Registered Charity No. 209629

In Public domain. Digitization Muthulakshmi Research Academy

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society

VOLUME 10 · PART 2 · JULY 2000

CONTENTS

Portuguese encounters with coastal Makran Baloch during the sixteenth century. Some references from a Balochi heroic epic
SABIR BADALKHAN 153

Kasai Zenzō's *With the Children in Tow.* (Ko o tsurete): a shi-shōsetsu
MASAKO NAKAGAWA 171

The illusion of an allusion: a soothing song for the exiled Prince Dipasana (d. ca 1840) in Ambon
EDWIN WIERINGA 193

Problems of name and lineage; relationships between South Indian authors of the *Śaiva Siddhānta*
DOMINIC GOODALL 205

Book Reviews 217

Other books received for review 301

Select list of accessions to the Library 303

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

1356-1863(200007)10:2;1-V